



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,215	04/08/2005	Kenji Kamada	KAMADA1	3815
1444	7590	01/27/2010	EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.			PESELEV, ELLI	
624 NINTH STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 300				1623
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/27/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/501,215	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAMADA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Elli Peselev	<b>Art Unit</b> 1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 25-28 and 35 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 25-28 and 35 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 13, 2009 has been entered.

Claims 25-28 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The terminology "residual solvent of 1500 ppm or below" (all occurrences) is not disclosed or suggested in the specification as originally filed..

Applicant's arguments filed November 13, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Hiraide et al (US2003/191296) appears to disclose that the Crystal Form D prepared from Crystal Form E is the same as the Crystal Form D claimed in the present application and that Hiraide et al discloses the content of the residual solvent to be 1500 ppm or below. This argument has not been found persuasive. The Hiraide et al application and/or patent has not been incorporated by reference in the present application. Further, it is not clear from the present claims if the claimed compound is the same Form D compound as disclosed by Hiraide et al.

For example, in claims 25-28, it is not stated what form is being prepared.

Further, claim 25 states the compound is prepared by stirring the Crystal Form E in a mixed solvent of ethyl acetate and water at less than 20 C. Hiraide et al disclose the temperature range of 10 to 20 C. Note that the terminology "less than 20 C" reads on "less than -50 C" or below. Claim 27 does not specify any temperature range. Also, the claimed compounds are identified by only two or three peaks. This is seen as insufficient to identify the claimed compounds to a specific crystal form because a number of different forms could potentially have two or three very similar peaks.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 25-28 and 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Miura et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,088).

Miura et al disclose a process of preparing form D crystals of hemifuramate anhydrate of erythromycin by dissolving fumarate crystals in ethyl acetate at room temperature, adding water, cooling the mixture to -10 C and filtering under vacuum (column 15, lines 18-25 and column 18, Example 8). The claimed compound and process is anticipated by Miura et al. In addition, if there are any differences in an amount of residual solvent in the claimed compound and the reference's compound, such differences would appear to be minor in nature, and the claimed compound and process would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made.

Applicant's arguments filed November 13, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that the prior art D-type crystals of Miura, have a number of problems, including a large volume of crystallization solvent remaining in the crystal as a residual solvent and a small particle size. This argument has not been found persuasive since applicant has not submitted any evidence in verified form showing the differences in amounts of residual solvent in the reference's crystal and the claimed crystal form. Thus the significance in the amount of residual solvent cannot be

ascertained. Table 1 disclosed by Hiraide et al has been considered. Said Table provides comparison between the preparation of form D crystals using 2% of water and 1.5% water disclosed by Miura et al. However, note that none of present claims are limited to any specific amount of water used. With respect to the claimed process of preparing form D crystals via form E crystals, note that form E crystals encompassed by the present claims are not identified by a specific X-ray diffraction pattern to distinguish said crystals from the crystals used by Miura et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elli Peselev  
/Elli Peselev/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623